The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"I am afraid that the labour involved in the preparation of statistics and making enquiries will be out of all proportion to the benefits that are likely to be derived from the enquiries."

Mr. F. E. JAMES:—"Is the hon. Member aware that in Bengal, in the Punjab and in Bombay this very thing which my hon. Friend, Mr. Stanes, suggested is being carried out most extensively?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"I am not aware."

Diwan Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR:—"With reference to the answer to clauses (b) and (c), may I know whether disputes have not arisen in the matter of prices between the Police department and the Jail department?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"No dispute has arisen with reference to prices."

Diwan Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR:—"May I know whether any matter of dispute has arisen with regard to quality?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"Yes, with reference to quality only."

Diwan Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR:—"May I know whether the price is not consistent with the quality and thus whether the dispute does not relate indirectly to price?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"It may be. But the dispute is not regarding price."

Diwan Bahadur C. S. RATNASABHAPATI MUDALIYAR:—"What orders have Government passed on the matter?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"The Government held a conference in which the Inspector-General of Police and the Inspector-General of Prisons took part, and certain conventions were reached."

Mr. V. M. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"May I ask what the nature of the complaint of the Police department is?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—"That the quality is not of the required standard."

Shipping and Navigation

Amount of quay dues earned by the Madras Port Trust.

* 18 Q.—B. POCKER SAHIB Bahadur: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether during the year 1931–32 the Landing Agents of the Madras Port were remunerated at the rate of Rs. 2 per ton for cargo landed by boats and Re. 1 per ton for cargo landed directly on the quay;

(b) whether in previous years the rates were the same for both kinds of cargo;

2nd August 1932]

(*c*) whether during 1931–32 the percentage of directly landed cargo has decreased, and if so, why;

(*d*) how many steamers can be accommodated in quay berths simultaneously;

(*e*) whether any steamer is over-kept in moorings and cargo landed from there, in spite of the fact that a quay berth is available for it;

(*f*) whether it is a fact that even from steamers at the quays, cargo is allowed to be landed into boats so that the Landing Agents would be enabled to earn Rs. 2 per ton instead of Re. 1; and

(*g*) what is the average rate of quay due per ton earned by the Madras Port Trust on cargo landed in the port during the year 1931–32?

A.—As the hon. Member is aware the Local Government are merely the Agents of the Government of India in regard to this matter.

It is presumed that the question relates only to cargo to which the consolidated landing charge is applicable.

(*a*) & (*b*) Yes.

(*c*) & (*f*) There has been a slight decrease in 1931–32 in the cargo landed direct on to the quay as compared with 1930–31, but an increase when compared with 1929–30 and a large increase over 1928–29. The landing of cargo is a matter under the control of the steamer agents. Cargo is frequently landed on to the quay on one side and into the boat on the other so as to expedite discharge.

(*d*) Four general cargo steamers and three coal steamers.

(*e*) This may happen as the occupation of quay berths is mainly controlled by shed accommodation.

(*g*) Approximately 4 annas 10 pies.

Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar:—"May I ask whether the Local Government have addressed the Government of India regarding the administration of the Port Trust in this matter of quay dues? If so, with what result?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar:—"The Local Government are not their own masters in this matter except with reference to certain minor and unimportant details."

Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed:—"May I know what part the Local Government plays in fixing the quay dues?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar:—"Ordinarily they accept the recommendations of the Port Trust Board in such matters."

Mr. Basheer Ahmed Sayeed:—"May I know whether the attention of the hon. the Law Member has been drawn to the fact that there is a great agitation to decrease the quay dues?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar:—"My attention has not been called to it."

Mr. V. M. Ramaswami Mudaliyar:—"May I know whether it is the function of the Local Government as the Agents of the Government of India to consider policies enunciated by the Harbour Port Trust regarding the labour employed by it?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar:—"The Local Government is only the Agent of the Government of India and does not consider questions of policy."

Irrigation

Settlement of the dispute regarding the anicut at Ramasagar.

* 19 *Q.*—Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to make a statement as to how the dispute between the ryots of the Madras and His Exalted Highness the Nizam's Governments with reference to the anicut at Ramasagar, Hospet taluk, Bellary district, has been settled, and if it has not yet been settled, the progress made in the negotiations towards settlement?

A.—It was agreed between His Exalted Highness the Nizam's Government and this Government that an Irrigation Engineer of each Government should meet at the site, discuss the question and submit a joint report with a view to an amicable settlement of the dispute. The joint report is awaited.

Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar:—"Have the Madras Government appointed their representatives?"

The hon. Sir Archibald Campbell:—"Yes."

The Kothapalli tank.

* 20 *Q.*—Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state with reference to G.O. Ms. No. 679 I., dated 7th March 1928—

(*a*) the progress, if any, made in the carrying out of the scheme for improving the Kothapalli tank, Rayadrug taluk, Bellary district; and

(*b*) if the work has not yet been taken up, why and when it is likely to be taken up?

A.—(*a*) No progress has been made.

(*b*) The scheme is one of those which depend on the Hagari; the consideration of all schemes on the Hagari has been postponed till a decision is arrived at about the Tungabhadra project.

Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar:—"May I know at what stage the consideration of Tungabhadra Project is now?"

The hon. Sir Archibald Campbell:—"As I have on previous occasion informed the Council the Tungabhadra Project is the subject of negotiation with the Hyderabad Government as well as with the Bombay Government and the Mysore Government."